

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

GEOFFREY ROBERT LAWSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

OCWEN LOAN SERVICING LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C10-5481BHS

ORDER DENYING  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Geoffrey Robert Lawson's ("Lawson") motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 47) of the Court's order denying his motion for leave to file his third amended complaint (Dkt. 42). The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of the motion and the remainder of the file and hereby denies Lawson's motion for reconsideration for the reasons stated herein.

**I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On July 7, 2010, Lawson filed his original complaint against Defendants. Dkt. 1. On July 20, 2010, Lawson filed his first amended complaint. Dkt. 8. On July 21, 2010, Lawson filed his second amended complaint. Dkt.10. On October 28, 2010, in response to Defendants' reply to his response to the motion to dismiss, Lawson filed a surreply in which he included a third amended complaint. *See* Dkt. 39. On November 3, 2010, Defendants filed a motion to strike the surreply and pointed out that Lawson did not file a proper motion to file his third amended complaint. Dkt. 41. On November 7, 2010, Lawson filed a motion for leave to file his third amended complaint. Dkt. 42. On

1 January 4, 2011, the Court issued an order denying Lawson's motion for leave. Dkt. 46.  
2 On January 11, 2011, Lawson filed the instant motion for reconsideration. Dkt. 47.

## 3 II. DISCUSSION

4 Motions for reconsideration are governed by Local Rule CR 7(h), which provides  
5 as follows:

6 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily  
7 deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior  
8 ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have  
9 been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.


10 Local Rule CR 7(h)(1).

11 The Court's order denying Lawson's motion to file his third amended complaint  
12 (Dkt. 46) does not represent manifest error. The Court also concludes that Lawson's  
13 motion for reconsideration effectively restates the same arguments made in his motion for  
14 leave to file his third amended complaint and does not present *relevant* new facts or legal  
15 authority that could not have been brought to the Court's attention prior to this motion.

## 16 III. ORDER

17 Therefore, for the reasons stated herein and because Lawson has not adequately  
18 met his burden under CR 7(h)(1), it is hereby **ORDERED** that Lawson's motion for  
19 reconsideration is **DENIED**.

20 DATED this 18th day of January 2011.

21   
22 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE  
23 United States District Judge  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28